It is the intention of the Legislature that CPEC shall coordinate an intersegmental review of student fee and financial aid policies in California. Such review shall be conducted by the Commission in consultation with an advisory committee of the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the legislature, the Legislative Analyst, the Governor's Office, the State Department of Finance, representatives of the California State University (CSU), California Community Colleges (CCC), University of California (UC), Hastings College of the Law

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT CHARGES AND SHORT-TERM FINANCIAL AID POLICIES AT CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

APRIL 1993

COMMISSION REPORT 93-8

Summary

In Supplemental Report Language to the 1991-92 Budget Act, the Legislature asked the Commission to coordinate an intersegmental review of student fees and financial aid -- including (1) the impact that alternative student fee and financial aid policies would have on General Fund revenues, student access, and financial aid requirements, (2) who should pay what share of the costs of higher education, (3) the relative advantages or disadvantages of raising student tuition compared with maintaining reduced funding for the Master Plan missions of the systems, and (4) "the consequences of all tuition and fee alternatives on the state's historic policies of access, choice, equity, and quality (including breadth of the instructional program, average student time to degree, and total cost of the baccalaureate to the student), with identification of any sub-group most likely to suffer negative consequences as a result "

In this report, the Commission begins to respond to that request It offers seven recommendations regarding student fee policy and short-term financial aid policy for undergraduates in the State's two public universities and the California Maritime Academy, and it explains how it arrived at those proposals

Since the publication of this report, the Commission has published *A New State Policy on Undergraduate Student Charges at California's Public Universities* (Commission Report 93-9) That report, which contains a dozen recommendations along with the principles that underlie them, has superceded this document

In future reports, the Commission will offer recommendations on these same topics for the California Community Colleges and for graduate and professional-school students, and it will then propose a long-term financial aid policy for all levels and systems of higher education in the State

The Commission adopted this report at its meeting on April 19, 1993, on recommendation of its Ad Hoc Committee on the Financing and Future of California Higher Education Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Commission at 1303 J Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, California 95814-2938

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT CHARGES AND SHORT-TERM FINANCIAL AID POLICIES AT CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Recommendations of the California Postsecondary Education Commission

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1303 J Street • Suite 500 • Sacramento, California 95814-2938

COMMISSION REPORT 93-8
PUBLISHED APRIL 1993

Contributing Staff Warren Halsey Fox, Karl M Engelbach, and Christopher W Carter

Contents

Displays

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT CHARGES AND SHORT-TERM FINANCIAL AID POLICIES AT CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

AS CALIFORNIA is poised on the edge of the twenty-first century, the demographic, fiscal, and educational challenges confronting the State are unparalleled The population of the schools is growing at the fastest rate in over 30 years, and the Class of 2000 is expected to be the largest that has graduated from high school in the State's history The last time the State was confronted with a burgeoning college-age population, its economy was robust, but now its economic condition is weaker than at any time since the great Depression of the 1930s -- for the past three years the State has been making budget decisions that have resulted in its providing less postsecondary opportunities for this current generation of students than for those of the past three decades

Moreover, diversity is second only to sheer growth in size as the most overarching characteristic of California's current elementary and secondary school students No one racial/ethnic group constitutes a majority of the elementary school population, and early in the next century, this will be true of California's population at large Moreover, data on student progress clearly show that the State's schools have been less successful in meeting the educational needs of students from the fastest growing groups than they have for students from other groups The challenge for the State to provide equitable educational opportunities for all students from kindergarten through graduate school is not only a moral imperative but also a socioeconomic necessity, since on it also rests the civic and economic well-being of the State

Yet the principles that have guided public postsecondary education in California since the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education -- access, quality, choice, and affordable cost -- are now at risk The California Postsecondary Education Commission recognizes that declining State support for higher education during the past three years has forced the State's systems of higher education to depart from their missions as called for in the Master Plan

- For example, reductions in State support at the California State University have driven its enrollment down despite a growing college-age population The State University is now serving nearly 40,000 fewer students than demographic estimates would have projected

- Over the past two years, student fees at both the University and State University have increased by over 60 percent despite the State's policy that increases be gradual, moderate, and predictable
- Further, State-based student financial aid has not been augmented to cover student fee increases Cal Grant funding has actually declined for the one in five eligible needy students fortunate enough to receive an award

Unfortunately, the State's current budget process ensures that this situation is not simply a function of hard economic times Even when economic recovery occurs, it is expected that the State's budget process will be ill-suited to provide California's higher education systems with the resources needed to keep pace with increased costs and anticipated enrollment growth

While the Commission strongly believes that the State should make higher education a top priority by committing the resources needed to ensure the access, quality, choice, and affordability available to past generations under the goals of the State's Master Plan are also available to future generations of State residents, it recognizes that California higher education is confronted with a challenge of unprecedented magnitude On the one hand, additional revenues and a more flexible budgetary structure are needed so that the State and its taxpayers can continue to support higher education as they have historically done in the past -- thereby avoiding fundamental and wholesale changes in the State's policies of access, quality, choice, and affordability However, the Commission also recognizes that the State currently lacks sufficient resources, budgetary flexibility, and political will to provide the resources needed to achieve the State's Master Plan policy goals As such, California higher education must develop plans premised on the amount of resources from the State likely to be available for its future support This means that California's higher education systems must, unfortunately, reexamine the ways in which the principles of the State's Master Plan for Higher Education -- a plan that has have served the State well for the past 30 years -- can be implemented, given today's realities

The Legislature recognized that the State had begun to depart from the "affordability" aspect of the State's Master Plan in enacting the first of the significant student fee increases in 1991-92 As a result, it requested in Supplemental Report Language to the 1991-92 Budget Act that the Commission coordinate an intersegmental review of student fee and financial aid policies in California Specifically, the Legislature requested that the Commission work with a broad-based advisory committee to analyze the impact of alternative student fee and financial aid policies at the State's public colleges and universities Having completed that analysis which appears in the Appendix, the Commission forwards the following recommendations to the Governor and Legislature regarding future undergraduate fee and financial aid policies for the State's public universities

Before presenting those recommendations, however, the Commission reiterates its belief that the State should provide to higher education the resources needed for California higher education to maintain the goals of access, quality, choice, and affordability called for in the State's Master Plan

The recommendations that follow are a result of the economic and political difficulties facing the State and do not represent the best public policy for the State or its higher education institutions As such, they represent only a partial solution to the challenges currently facing the State's public colleges and universities as these institutions attempt to continue meeting the goals of access, quality, and choice of the Master Plan with declining State resources

Rationale for the Commission's recommendations on student fees and financial aid

In developing its recommendation for a new long-term student fee policy for the State's public universities during this time of fiscal constraint, the Commission identified the following principles that serve as the basis or rationale for its student fee policy recommendations

- Students, their families, and society share in the responsibility for financing the costs of a college education
- Student charges should not increase simply to fill the budgetary gap caused by any reduction in the State's General Fund support
- Student fee increases, to the extent possible, must become predictable so that students and their families can prepare for the costs of college attendance
- Grant aid should be made available to offset any increase in student charges for all financially needy students to ensure that educational opportunities are available to all students, irrespective of economic means
- The vocabulary used to describe student charges should be revised to reflect reality and a change in the allowable uses of revenues generated by student charges
- The original Master Plan policy of "affordability" must not be forgotten and, as such, this policy recommendation should be reconsidered within the next five years This reconsideration will, among other results, remind the State of its historic policy goals which the Commission continues to support

Commission recommendations on student fees and financial aid

Based upon the above principles, the Commission forwards the following policy recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature

- Fees for undergraduate students at the California Maritime Academy, the California State University, and the University of California should be based on a percentage of the average cost of instruction in their respective system or institution, with the State paying the balance of the cost Consistent with California's commitment to the principle of affordability, the percentage of the average cost of instruction that students will be required to pay may vary by system

- Given any increase in student charges, the State should increase its budget item for State-funded financial aid by an amount sufficient to fully cover the fee increase for all financially needy students (See "Future Plans" section below regarding the development of a long-term State financial aid policy)
- If necessary, student charges in each system should increase incrementally over the next three years such that, at the end of that time, student charges are no greater than the percentages to be determined
- The calculation of average cost of instruction should include State, local, and student generated revenue and should be calculated annually by the Commission working in consultation with an advisory committee using revenue and enrollment data from the prior year
- To ensure that the cost of instruction does not dramatically increase in the future, the Commission should continue its work with various advisory committees to identify alternatives that could reduce the cost of instruction while maintaining educational quality These efforts should be undertaken with the goal of limiting increases in the cost of instruction and hence preventing significant student fee increases as the cost of instruction rises
- Mandatory systemwide student charges at the State's public universities should be called tuition rather than fees to reflect the reality of how such revenues are currently being used Tuition -- as contrasted to fees -- can be used to support the direct cost of instruction Since fee revenues may be already being used for direct instructional purposes, the State's existing limitation on the use of fee revenues should also be removed to reflect reality
- Each public institution should develop a process to consult with students regarding how tuition revenue shall be used

This policy should be reviewed five years after its initial implementation to consider its overall impact and whether economic and political circumstances enable the State to return to its Master Plan policy goal of providing low-cost higher education

Future plans The Commission will offer recommendations concerning student charges at the California Community Colleges, graduate and professional student charges at the State's public universities and the Hastings College of the Law, as well as other differential pricing policies for the State's public colleges and universities, in the near future In addition, it is in the process of developing a long-term State student financial aid policy and anticipates offering its recommendations for that policy in the coming months as well

OPTIONS AND ALTERNATIVES FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT FEE POLICIES

A Staff Report Relating to the Financing and Future of California Higher Education

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1303 J Street ◆ Suite 500 ◆ Sacramento, California 95814-2938

Introduction and Purpose of this Report

AS CALIFORNIA is poised on the edge of the twenty-first century, the demographic, fiscal, and educational challenges confronting the State are unparalleled The population of the schools is growing at the fastest rate in over 30 years, and the Class of 2000 is expected to be the largest that has graduated from high school in the State's history The last time the State was confronted with a burgeoning college-age population, its economy was robust, but now its economic condition is weaker than at any time since the great Depression of the 1930s and the State is hard pressed to provide the same postsecondary opportunities for this current generation of students as for those of the past three decades

Moreover, diversity is second only to sheer growth in size as the most overarching characteristic of California's current elementary and secondary school students No one racial/ethnic group constitutes a majority of the elementary school population, and early in the next century, this will be true of California's population at large Moreover, data on student progress clearly show that the State's schools have been less successful in meeting the educational needs of students from the fastest growing groups than they have for students from other groups The challenge for the State to provide equitable educational opportunities for all students from kindergarten through graduate school is not only a moral imperative but also a socioeconomic necessity, since on it also rests the civic and economic well-being of the State

Yet the principles that have guided public postsecondary education in California since the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education -- access, quality, and affordable cost -- are now at risk because of these fiscal and demographic realities The California Postsecondary Education Commission recognizes that declining State support for higher education during the past two years has forced the State's systems of higher education to depart from their missions as called for in the Master Plan

- For example, reductions in State support at the California State University have driven its enrollment down despite a growing college-age population The State University is now serving nearly 40,000 fewer students than demographic estimates would have projected

- Over the past two years, student fees at both the University and State University have increased by over 60 percent despite the State's policy that increases be gradual, moderate, and predictable
- Further, State-based student financial aid has not been augmented to cover student fee increases Cal Grant funding has actually declined for the one in four eligible needy students fortunate enough to receive an award

Unfortunately, the State's current budget process ensures that this situation is not simply a function of hard economic times Even when economic recovery occurs, it is expected that the State's budget process will be unable to provide California's higher education systems with the resources needed to keep pace with increased costs and anticipated enrollment growth

As a result of this conclusion, California higher education is confronted with two fundamentally different alternatives On the one hand, it could actively advocate that additional tax revenues be generated by the State so that the State and its taxpayers could continue to support higher education as they have historically done in the past -- thereby avoiding fundamental and wholesale changes in the State's policies of access, quality, and affordability Alternatively, higher education can develop plans premised on the amount of State tax revenue likely to be available for its support This latter alternative means that California's higher education systems must reexamine the principles of access, quality, choice, and equity contained in the State's Master Plan for Higher Education The Commission has formed its Ad Hoc Committee on the Financing and Future of California Higher Education to assist the State in considering these two alternatives

The Legislature recognized that the State had begun to depart from the ''affordability'' aspect of the State's Master Plan in enacting the student fee increases of 1991-92 As a result, it requested in Supplemental Report Language to the 1991-92 Budget Act that the Commission coordinate an intersegmental review of student fee and financial aid policies in California The Legislature specified

> The review shall include, but need not be limited to, the following
>
> a An analysis of the total costs to the state of the instructional mission in the three segments of public higher education, in comparison, to the extent possible, to comparable public and private institutions in California and nationally
>
> b Alternative student tuition, fee, and financial aid policies, and their consequences upon general fund revenues, student access, and financial aid requirements

c Discussion of future State policies on who should pay what share of the costs of higher education

d A review of the relative advantages or disadvantages of raising student tuition as a source of general fund revenue as contrasted with maintaining reduced funding for the current Master Plan missions

Particular attention shall be paid to the consequences of all tuition and fee alternatives on the state's historic policies of access, choice, equity, and quality (including breadth of the instructional program, average student time to degree, and total cost of the baccalaureate to the student), with identification of any sub-group most likely to suffer negative consequences as a result

The purpose of this document is to begin to respond to Item b of that legislative request This report represents the first in a series of documents that the Commission will ultimately present to the Legislature in order to respond fully to the request

In this report, Commission staff analyzes, to the extent currently possible, four student fee policy options for setting undergraduate student fees that could be implemented in all three of California's public higher education systems These four options have been chosen for analysis at the suggestion of the Commission's advisory committee with which Commission staff has consulted throughout the development of this report In subsequent reports, the Commission will analyze graduate student fee alternatives, as well as other fee alternatives that are system-specific and were also chosen for analysis based on suggestions of the Commission's advisory committee convened pursuant to the legislative request

While Commission staff would have preferred to present its analyses of all student fee options in a single report, that was not possible because information from the Student Aid Commission's Student Expenses and Resources Survey (SEARS) -- essential to such analysis -- was not released to the Commission until mid-January The Commission wishes to thank the Student Aid Commission and its staff for their assistance and cooperation in providing the SEARS data that serve as a foundation for much of the analyses that follow

Throughout the following analyses, the Postsecondary Education Commission has attempted to be as conservative as possible in estimating the amount of net revenue that may be generated from implementation of these student fee policy options If the staff has overestimated the amount of financial aid that would be needed to assist financially needy students, the net revenue generated from implementation of these options will be greater than that estimated here It should also be noted that the analyses relate only to undergraduate students They do not include any revenues generated or aid required by graduate students, should the policy options be extended to apply to graduate as well as undergraduate students

It should also be noted that this report attempts only to estimate the amount of additional grant aid that should be made available under various levels of student fees and it assumes that all such aid is funded from the gross revenue generated from the fee increase It does not assume that a portion of the required financial aid would be funded through the Cal Grant program This report does not discuss or make recommendations about the State's student financial aid policies Currently, each of the systems employs different practices and policies regarding the distribution of institutionally-based grant assistance and those differences are not reflected in this report After the Commission has a better indication of which of these four fee options might be implemented, it will make recommendations concerning future student financial aid policies and practices it believes would be appropriate for the State's public colleges and universities

The legislative language calls for the Commission to analyze the impact of alternative student fee policies on "general fund revenues, student access, and financial aid requirements " The Commission has interpreted "general fund revenues" to mean the net additional fee revenue generated by implementation of the option that is available to the system for operating expenses The Commission staff's estimation of that amount as well as the additional financial aid required if the option were implemented is contained in the following options where possible

The second portion of the request -- to analyze the impact that alternative policies would have on student access -- is far more complicated than estimating the general fund revenues or financial aid requirements associated with each of the various policy alternatives The difficulty in estimating the impact that these alternative policies would have on student access relates to the fact that student access -- student enrollments -- are a function of number of competing factors Among the factors that may play a significant role in influencing student enrollment levels at the State's public colleges and universities are

- Overall revenue available to each system for support of its instructional mission,
- Student fee and tuition levels,
- Adequacy of student financial aid and knowledge of its availability,
- Demographic changes occurring in the State's population,
- Policies and practices of other higher education institutions,
- Students' choices and preferences as they relate to higher education,
- Information in the media regarding higher education,

- Perceptions of course availability, and
- Overall economic conditions present in the State

Since each of these factors is changing simultaneously, it is difficult to determine which of them is playing the most significant role in the enrollment changes occurring in California's public higher education systems However, given the State's current fiscal condition and the impact that it has had on the budgets of California's public colleges and universities, Commission staff hypothesize that the one factor playing the most significant role in influencing student access at the State's public colleges and universities is the overall revenue available to them to support their instructional missions Thus, given that hypothesis, Commission staff believe that in order to accurately analyze the impact that any given fee/aid option might have on student access, it is necessary to consider the total revenue available to the system under that option which could support the system's instructional mission

Display 1 on the next page attempts to address the issue of student access in terms of revenue available to support instructional activities under three alternative fee/aid scenarios As the display indicates, in the current year (1992-93) governmental and student fee revenues available to support the general instructional mission in each of California's public higher education systems amounts to approximately $3,072 per full-time-equivalent student (FTE) at the community colleges, about $7,337 per FTE at the State University, and around $11,023 per FTE at the University of California If one assumes that the systems will need about that same revenue per FTE next year (1993-94) as they received this year, then one can estimate the total number of students to whom the systems could provide access given a projected level of revenue

Thus, if one assumes that student fees increase by 10 percent in 1993-94 for all students in all three public higher education systems and adequate financial aid is made available to offset the fee increase with a full grant for all needy students, Commission staff estimates that such an increase would generate approximately $9 5 million in additional net revenue in the community colleges, about $20 5 million at the State University, and approximately $26 0 million at the University of California When this revenue is added to the amount which the Governor proposes to provide to the systems from governmental sources in 1993-94 and to current student fee revenues, we obtain an estimate of the amount of revenue available in 1993-94 to support the general instructional activities of each system If one assumes that the systems will need the same level of revenue per FTE in 1993-94 as they received per FTE this year, we obtain an estimate of the number of FTE students which could be accommodated As the display indicates, given these assumptions, the community colleges would have

DISPLAY 1 Impact on Full-Time-Equivalent Enrollment Under Various Fee Scenarios

	California Community Colleges	The California State University	University of California
1992-93 Estimated FTE Enrollment[a]	878,582	257,000	141,697
1992-93 Government Appropriations[b]	$2,572,500,000	$1,501,000,000	$1,127,100,000
1992-93 Student Fee Revenue	$126,069,000	$384,675,000	$434,852,000
Total 1992-93 Government and Student Fee Revenue	$2,698,569,000	$1,885,675,000	$1,561,952,000
1992-93 Government and Student Fee Revenue Available Per FTE	$3,072	$7,337	$11,023
10 Percent Student Fee Increase Scenario			
Annual Systemwide Full-Time Fee Level Under this Scenario	$330	$1,439	$3,106
Proposed 1993-94 Government Appropriations[b]	$2,310,100,000	$1,433,200,000	$1,046,160,000
Fee Revenue from Currently Adopted 1992-93 Student Fee Levels	$165,069,000	$384,675,000	$434,852,000
Net Additional Student Fee Revenue Under this Scenario[c]	$9,500,000	$20,500,000	$26,000,000
Total Potential Government and Fee Revenue Under this Scenario	$2,484,669,000	$1,838,375,000	$1,518,712,000
Number of FTE Students Who Could be Provided Access if 1992-93 Revenue Levels Per FTE Student are Maintained in 1993-94	808,811	250,562	137,776
Potential Change in FTE Students Under this Scenario	-69,770	-6,438	-3,920
Student Fees Set at 25 Percent of the Cost of Instruction at CCC and at 35 Percent at CSU and UC			
Annual Systemwide Full-Time Fee Level Under this Scenario	$800	$2,640	$4,260
Proposed 1993-94 Government Appropriations[b]	$2,310,100,000	$1,433,200,000	$1,046,160,000
Fee Revenue from Currently Adopted 1992-93 StudentFee Levels	$165,069,000	$384,675,000	$434,852,000
Net Additional Student Fee Revenue Under this Scenario[c]	$152,000,000	$200,000,000	$127,000,000
Total Potential Government and Fee Revenue Under this Scenario	$2,627,169,000	$1,217,875,000	$1,608,012,000
Number of FTE Students Who Could be Provided Access if 1992-93 Revenue Levels Per FTE Student are Maintained	855,198	275,027	145,877
Potential Change in FTE Students Under this Scenario	-23,384	18,027	4,180
Set Community College Fees at $1,050, CSU fees at $1,740, and UC fees at $3,710			
Annual Systemwide Full-Time Fee Level Under this Scenario	$1,050	$1,740	$3,710
Proposed 1993-94 Government Appropriations[b]	$2,310,100,000	$1,433,200,000	$1,046,160,000
Fee Revenue from Currently Adopted 1992-93 Student Fee Levels	$165,069,000	$384,675,000	$434,852,000
Net Additional Student Fee Revenue Under this Scenario[c]	$223,400,000	$67,800,000	$81,000,000
Total Potential Government and Fee Revenue Under this Scenario	$2,698,569,000	$1,885,675,000	$1,562,012,000
Number of FTE Students Who Could be Provided Access if 1992-93 Revenue Levels Per FTE Student are Maintained	878,582	257,000	141,702
Potential Change in FTE Students Under this Scenario	0	0	0

a. For the University of California, health science enrollments are excluded The source of these figures is the Legislative Analyst's Analysis of the Proposed 1993 State Budget.

b Includes local property tax revenue for the community colleges. For the University of California, this figure represents 60 percent of the total State General Fund support for the University -- the approximate amount which supports instruction of all non-health science students at the University

c This amount represents the net additional fee revenue generated after subtracting the amount needed to provide adequate levels of student financial aid. Depending on the system and on the size of the fee increase, Commission staff estimates that between 43 and 55 percent of the additional gross revenue generated from these options must be returned to provide adequate levels of student financial assistance to ensure that access losses resulting solely from the fee increases will be minimal

Source California Postsecondary Education Commission staff estimates funding available to accommodate approximately 808,800 FTE, the State University about 250,600 FTE, and the University about 137,800 FTE In all three systems this would be a decline from current FTE enrollment levels Commission staff estimates that community college enrollment would decline by 69,800 FTE, the State University's would decline by 6,400 FTE, and the University's would decline by 3,900 FTE

If student fees were set at 25 percent of the total average cost of instruction in the community colleges ($800 per year), and at 35 percent of the total average cost of instruction at the State University ($2,640 per year) and University ($4,260), given the above assumptions, we estimate that community college FTE enrollments would still decline -- by about 23,000 FTE -- while those at the State University and University would actually increase, by about 18,000 FTE and 4,000 FTE, respectively, for a total net decline of 1,000 FTE in the public institutions

One question some may ask is given the above assumptions at what level would fees need to be set in order for total instructional revenue in each system to remain at current year levels and thereby enable the systems to continue to accommodate their current FTE enrollment levels Commission estimates given these assumptions, that in order for access not to be cut relative to 1992-93 levels due to declining revenues, community college fees would need to rise to $1,050, those at the State University to about $1,740, while those at the University to $3,710 per year

Commission staff would like to reiterate that the above figures are only its best estimates based on a number of assumptions These assumptions include that

1 The systems will receive in 1993-94 the amount of governmental revenue proposed by the Governor in his proposed 1993-94 State Budget

2 The systems will need in 1993-94 the same amount of revenue per FTE as they received in 1992-93

3 The systems will continue to allocate funds among their varied functions as they currently do

4 Sufficient levels of student financial aid will be provided and information regarding its availability will be effectively disseminated The Commission staff estimates that, in order to provide sufficient financial aid, depending on the system and the size of the fee increase between 46 and 58 percent of additional gross revenue generated from the proposed fee increases would need to be returned to aid This percentage is significantly higher than current levels

5 If the Commission staff's estimated levels of aid are provided and information about their availability are effectively disseminated, enrollment losses related exclusively to the fee increase would be minimal

Given the Commission staff's belief that overall revenue available to the systems is currently the primary factor influencing student access at the State's public colleges and universities, one may ask what impact do the various fee/aid options -- in and of themselves -- have on student access National literature relating to the impact of fee and financial aid increases on an individual student's enrollment decision is varied Most such literature recognizes that increases in student fees without consideration of student financial aid does have some impact on a student's enrollment decisions, with that impact varying based on the student's demographic and income characteristics However, the literature that attempts to include an analysis of student financial aid coupled with an increase in student fees evidences great variability in their findings Most of that literature suggests that the provision of additional financial aid does minimize the impact of a fee increase However, the extent of the influence that increased aid plays -- which, in part, is a function of how much aid is provided -- in minimizing the impact of the fee increase varies considerably from study to study One study suggests that providing students with some aid to offset the fee increase will still result in some students making alternative enrollment decisions, while other studies indicate that if students receive a full grant to offset any increase in fees, their enrollment decisions will remain the same More comprehensive discussions of this subject in the literature recognize, however, that students' enrollment decisions are a function of more than just student fee and financial aid levels, rather, they are a result of many other considerations -- including the school's location, reputation, and program offerings, to name just a few As such, this literature suggests that analysis of only financial considerations will not translate into accurate predictions of student behavior because of these other non-financial factors which play a significant role in students' ultimate enrollment decisions

As a result of the differing findings contained in the national literature, the following analyses of four options for fee policy assume that if the level of financial aid suggested by the Commission's analysis is actually provided and information regarding its availability is comprehensively distributed, undergraduate enrollment declines relating exclusively to the fee increase would be minimal While the Commission staff believes that this assumption is fairly accurate, it does wish to recognize that the national literature on the subject of the impact that grant aid has on offsetting student fee increases is inconclusive

In reviewing the four options that follow, one may wish to keep in mind the student fee increases already adopted or proposed for the 1993-94 academic year The Trustees of the California State University have also approved a $480 increase in systemwide undergraduate student fees for 1993-94 This $480 increase will bring the State University's systemwide fees for a full-time undergraduate student to $1,788 next year Full-time graduate students at the State University would be required to pay a total of $2,148 next year, an increase of $840 Unlike the University of California, however, the State University's student fee in creases must be approved by the Governor and Legislature before final enactment The University of California Board of Regents has approved a $995 increase in systemwide student fees for 1993-94, bringing the University's total systemwide student fees to $3,819 for a full-time undergraduate or graduate student in 1993-94 The Governor has proposed as part of his 1993-94 budget that community college fees rise to $30 per semester unit for non-baccalaureate degree holders, while those with such degrees would pay the full cost of their instruction

A second item that readers may wish to be mindful of in considering the options that follow relates to the issue of predictability The State's existing long-term student fee policy for the University and State University calls for student fee increases to be "gradual, moderate, and predictable" However, fee increases are only predictable if the State and its institutions follow whatever policy is in place Thus, none of the following options, including the current long-term policy, ensures predictable fee increases in the future, unless the policy is followed without exception

Finally, the Commission staff is currently in the process of surveying other states to obtain a greater understanding of how student charges at their public two-year institutions are determined by type of instruction offered (i e , academic/transfer, technical/vocational, basic skills) The staff hopes that this additional information will be of assistance in discussing student charges at California's public community colleges, since they offer a wide range of instructional services that may need to be priced differentially

1. Maintain the State's Current Long-Term Student Fee Policy for UC and CSU and Extend It to the Community Colleges

The proposed option

This option would maintain the State's current student fee policy, which calls for fee increases to be gradual, moderate, and predictable That policy indexes fee increases for the University of California and the California State University to the three-year moving average of State support per full-time-equivalent student Notwithstanding the three-year average, the policy permits fees to rise by up to 10 percent when the State's expenditures and revenues are substantially imbalanced No State policy is currently in place for annually adjusting fees in the community colleges However, this option includes the alternative of extending the State's current policy on fees at the University of California and the California State University to the community colleges

Background on the option

California has historically maintained a commitment to providing a "tuition free," low-cost, publicly supported system of higher education, with "tuition" being defined as any monies assessed to pay for the direct cost of instruction

This low-cost fee philosophy provided what was believed to be one of the best vehicles available for promoting access It was further grounded in the political and economic principle that there is a widespread social and economic benefit from public investment in higher education, rather than simply a private or individual benefit Thus, access to higher education in California is viewed more as a social right than an individual privilege

The Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for California Higher Education supported the low cost philosophy, but noted that students in all three public segments should bear a portion of the total cost of their education

In 1985, California enacted SB 195 (Maddy) -- a long-term resident student fee policy for the University of California, the California State University, and Hastings College of the Law

The policy stipulated that the State shall bear the primary responsibility for the cost of providing higher education, but that students should be responsible for a portion of those costs

It calls for fee increases to be gradual, moderate, and predictable and announced ten months in advance In cases where the State's revenues and expenditures are substantially imbalanced, the policy allows for fee increases of up to, but no more than, 10 percent

Otherwise, the policy calls for fee increases to be indexed to the three-year moving average of changes in State support per FTE student using either (1) all State support for the segment except lottery revenue, capital outlay, financial aid, or (2) all State support for the segment except lottery revenue, capital outlay, financial aid, instruction, organized activities, research, public service, and teaching hospitals

In addition, the policy eliminated the fee differential between undergraduate and graduate students that was present at the University of California

Finally, the policy stipulated that no resident fee revenue could be used for instructional purposes

SB 195 sunsetted in 1990, but was extended with minor technical modifications through 1996 with the passage of SB 1645 (Dills) in 1990

Despite the State's long-term student fee policy, the past several years have seen fee increases at the University of California and the California State University in excess of the 10 percent limit specified in statute The State's ongoing budget difficulties have resulted in the systems pursuing large fee increases to help offset reductions in General Fund support Increases in systemwide fees at the University of California were 40 and 24 percent in 1991-92 and 1992-93 respectively Increases in systemwide fees at the California State University for the same two years were 20 and 40 percent

Fees at the California Community Colleges did not change in 1991-92, but the cost per unit climbed from $6 to $10 per semester unit beginning January 1, 1993 In addition, with the new fee level came the elimination of a cap on fees

Due to UC's constitutional autonomy, UC's fee increases did not require suspension of the current fee policy statutes CSU's increases did require legislation, and the legislation ultimately enacted suspended the current fee policy for four years by authorizing a 40 percent fee increase for 1992-93, freezing the fee through 1994-95, and reducing CSU's base student fee for 1995-96 to the 1991-92 level Fees at the community colleges are specified in statute, so the change in 1992-93, like any change in community college fees, required legislation

The declining levels of General Fund support for higher education in recent years mean that indexing fees for 1993-94 to the three-year moving average of State support per FTE as specified in current statute would yield a *decline* in fees at both the University of California and the California State University This fact, coupled with the reduced level of State support proposed in the Governor's 1993-94 Budget, leads Commission staff to conclude that a 10 percent increase in student fees for 1993-94 would be likely if the State followed its current student fee policy

Potential non-fiscal impact of the option

The State's current student fee policy is premised on keeping fees as low as possible That policy was believed to be one of the best vehicles available for providing access to higher education for all California citizens Past Commission analysis suggests, however, that this policy has not provided equal access to all California citizens Prior analysis indicates that the proportion of students from middle-income backgrounds enrolled at the University and the State University decreased from 1982 to 1988 -- a period during which growth occurred statewide in this income group However, Student Aid Commission analysis of data from the 1985 and 1992 Student Expenses and Resources Surveys (SEARS) suggests that changes in the proportion of middle-income students enrolled at the University and State University are consistent with changes in this income group in the population as a whole Commission staff will reexamine this issue based on its own analysis of income data now available from SEARS

As is the case with any increase in student fees, students from low- and middle-income backgrounds could be seriously affected by this proposal if the State and its public institutions do not provide sufficient financial aid to offset the fee increase for needy students An estimate of the amount of additional aid required to offset the fee increase for needy students resulting from implementation of this proposal is discussed below under the section titled "Potential Fiscal Impact of the option "

Furthermore, access to higher education is hampered not only by student charges but also by insufficient institutional revenue to allow colleges and universities to offer the classes students need or desire Reduced levels of State support for California's systems of higher education have resulted in the systems turning to fee increases in excess of the 10 percent specified in the State's current fee policy to generate additional revenue in order for them to adequately support their instructional activities Constraining that revenue by limiting fee increases to 10 percent may require the systems to reduce the number of course sections offered, thereby reducing the systems' ability to accommodate students A more extensive discussion of this issue and an illustration of the potential consequences in terms of accommodating students of limiting fee increases to 10 percent is included in the introduction to this report Thus, reducing course availability may result in inhibiting student access in much the same way as steep increases in fees without adequate financial aid to assist students with limited financial resources Both access to the system and access to courses should be considered in evaluating this option

Potential fiscal impact of the option

The following analysis contains the Commission staff's estimates of the additional student fee revenue that would be generated and the additional financial aid that would be required if this option were implemented The analysis includes not only the University of California and the California State University, which are both included in the State's current long-term fee policy, but also the Community Colleges to demonstrate the fee revenue that would be generated if they were included in the State's current long-term fee policy Display 2 on the next page presents this information in tabular form All calculations are for undergraduate students only and do not include any revenues generated or aid required by graduate students should this fee option be extended to apply to graduate as well as undergraduate students

Throughout the following analysis, Commission staff has attempted to be as conservative as possible in estimating the amount of net additional student fee revenue that may be generated from implementation of this option If the level of grant aid estimated below is more than the amount actually needed to serve financially needy students, net revenues resulting from implementation of the option would be greater than that estimated

California Community Colleges

If the State were to apply its current long-term fee policy for the University of California and the California State University to the California Community College for 1993-94, fees at the California's Community Colleges would likely increase 10 percent, or $1 per unit This increase would result in annual fees for a full-time student increasing from $300 to $330 Commission staff estimate that this option would net $9 5 million in additional student fee revenue after funding is provided for financial aid (see Attachment for an explanation of Commission staff's methodology for estimating necessary financial aid) The cost of providing this amount of additional grants is approximately $10 5 million, or 52 percent of the total $20 million in additional student fee revenue generated by this proposal If this level of grant aid is provided, Commission staff believe that student enrollment declines related exclusively to the student fee increase will be minimal

The California State University

If the State were to follow its current long-term student fee policy for 1993-94, fees at the California State University would likely increase 10 percent, or $131 for full-time students This would result in a systemwide fee of $1,439 Commission staff estimate that such a fee increase would net $16 5 million in additional student fee revenue after funding is provided for financial aid (see Attachment for an explanation of Commission staff's methodology for estimating necessary financial aid) The cost of providing this amount of additional grants is $16 5 million, or 50 percent

DISPLAY 2 Implications of Increasing Systemwide Student Fees by 10 Percent at the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California

	California Community Colleges	The California State University	University of California
Current Annual Full-Time Systemwide Fee Level	$300	$1,308	$2,824
10 Percent Fee Increase	30	131	282
Systemwide Fee Level with Increase	330	1,439	3,106
Additional Student Fee Revenue Generated	$20 million	$33 million	$35 million
Additional Amount of Financial Aid Required for Needy Students	$10 5 million	$16 5 million	$15 million
Percentage of Additional Gross Fee Revenue Returned to Aid	52%	50%	43%
Net Additonal Student Fee Revenue	$9 5 million	$16 5 million	$20 million

Source California Postsecondary Education Commission staff analysis

of the total $33 million in additional student fee revenue generated by this proposal If this level of grant is provided, Commission staff believe that student enrollment declines related *exclusively* to the student fee increase will be minimal

University of California

If the State were to follow its current fee policy for 1993-94, fees at the University of California would likely increase 10 percent, or $282 for a full-time student This increase would result in a systemwide fee for an undergraduate of $3,106 Commission staff estimate that this option would net $20 million in additional student fee revenue (see the Attachment on pages 43-45 for an explanation of Commission staff's methodology for estimating necessary financial aid) The cost of providing this amount of additional grants is approximately $15 million, or 43 percent of the total $35 million in additional student fee revenue generated by this proposal If this level of grant aid is provided, Commission staff believe that student enrollment declines related *exclusively* to the student fee increase will be minimal

2. Set Student Charges at Public Institutions as a Specified Percentage of the Cost of Instruction

The proposed option

Student fees at California's public colleges and universities would be set and adjusted annually based on a specified percentage of the cost of instruction in each system

Background on the option

A number of states set the level of student charges at their public colleges and universities at a specified percentage of the institution's cost of providing instruction Display 3 on the following page lists states using this approach for setting their student charges' levels As the display indicates, there is variability among states using this approach in terms of the percentage of instructional cost which students must bear Generally speaking, these states set fees at their community colleges somewhere between 20 and 30 percent of the cost of instruction, for comprehensive institutions similar to the California State University, the percentage varies between 22 and 35 percent of the cost of instruction with many states charging 25 percent of cost, while student charges at research universities similar to the University of California vary from 25 to 35 percent of the cost of instruction for undergraduate students, with many charging such students somewhere between 30 and 35 percent of average cost

The Commission is currently in the process of surveying other states to obtain a greater understanding of how student charges at public two-year institutions in other states are determined by type of instruction offered (i e academic/transfer, technical/vocational, basic skills) Commission staff hope that this additional information will be of assistance in discussing student charges at California's public community colleges since they offer a wide range of instructional services that may need to be priced differentially

One of the most important elements in implementing this proposed fee option is the need for agreement on the calculation of the cost of instruction in each of California's public higher education systems and whether an average cost should be calculated for each level of instruction offered by the system Unfortunately, data is not currently available that would enable calculation of the average cost of instruction by level and, as a result, the focus of current efforts has been limited to calculation of the average

DISPLAY 3 States That Set Resident Tuition and/or Fees as a Percentage of Instructional Costs or State Appropriations

Arizona	Tuition set at 22 5 percent of cost of education
Arkansas	Tuition set at 30 percent of the cost of instruction
Colorado	Tuition set between 25 and 30 percent of the cost of instruction
Connecticut	Tuition set at 20-25 percent of prior-year appropriations per student
Florida	The goal is to set tuition at 25 percent of the cost of instruction Costs are based on prior-year expenditures for direct instruction as well as a pro-rated share of other costs (i e , administration, library, etc)
Georgia	Tuition set at 25 percent of total educational and general expenditures, excluding funds for public service, continuing education, and capital and equipment replacement or improvement
Illinois	Tuition set at approximately 33 percent of the cost of education Appropriations for retirement, capital improvements, research, and public service are excluded from the calculation
Maryland	Tuition set at 30 percent of the cost of education
Massachusetts	Undergraduate tuition is set at 30 percent of prior-year educational cost per student at four-year institutions and at 25 percent at the community colleges Cost of education includes instruction, academic and institutional support services, student services, and plant maintenance Graduate tuition (except medicine and maritime) set at 125 percent of undergraduate tuition
Minnesota	Tuition set at 33 percent of the cost of education in the collegiate systems and at 27 percent in the state's technical institutes Costs include expenditures for direct instruction as well as support related to instruction
Missouri	Tuition at the University is set at 33 percent of the cost of instruction At the state's baccalaureate institutions it is set at 26 percent of cost, while at the community colleges, it is set at 20 percent
New Jersey	Tuition set at approximately 30 percent of average educational cost for undergraduates and at 45 percent of average educational cost for graduate students
Oklahoma	Tuition set at 30 percent of the cost of instruction
Tennessee	Undergraduate student fees set at 30-32 percent of appropriations at the state's universities and 24-26 percent at its two-year institutions Graduate tuition (except for medicine, vet med , and dentistry) set 50 percent higher than undergraduate tuition
Virginia	Tuition set at 25 percent of the cost of education at senior institutions and at 20 percent of cost at the community colleges
Washington	Undergraduate tuition set at 33 percent of the instructional costs at the state's research universities, 25 percent of cost at the regional universities, and 23 percent of cost at the community colleges Graduate tuition in all institutions is set at 23 percent of the instructional cost
Wisconsin	Tuition set at 35 percent of educational cost which includes instruction, student services, academic support, and a pro-rated share of administration, physical plant, and depreciation

Source California Postsecondary Education Commission staff analysis.

cost of instruction by revenue source for all instructional levels combined Another issue that remains to be discussed if this policy option were to be implemented is whether students should pay a percentage of the total average cost of instruction from all revenue sources or a percentage of the cost only from specific revenue sources

Commission staff has worked with the systems, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst's Office, to develop a methodology for calculating the average cost of instruction by revenue source for each of California's three public higher education systems For purposes of the following analysis, staff has used the total average cost of instruction from all revenue sources, recognizing that the issue of whether to include all revenue sources in the calculation of the student charges level still needs to be resolved

For the community colleges, the total average cost of instruction from all revenue sources is $3,178 per full-time-equivalent student (FTES) At the State University, the total average cost from all revenue sources is $7,551 per FTES, and, at the University of California, the amount is $12,168 per general campus FTES, which excludes all health science students Given these costs of instruction, students currently enrolled in the community colleges pay about 9 percent of the total average cost of instruction, students enrolled at the State University pay about 17 percent of the total average cost, and students at the University of California pay about 23 percent of the total average cost of instruction from all revenue sources

Potential non-fiscal impact of the option

According to proponents of this option, one of its greatest advantages is that it would clearly articulate what share of responsibility the student and the State have for financing the costs of a public higher education However, its implementation would violate one of California's traditions higher education should be tuition free A major provision of the State's current student fee policy is that students do not pay tuition -- monies that support the cost of direct instruction -- but rather pay only fees which help support programs and activities complementary to instruction If this option were enacted, California would be departing from its historic commitment of providing a "tuition free" higher education

In addition, the State's current student fee policy is premised on keeping fees as low as possible That policy was believed to be one of the best vehicles available for providing access to higher education for all California citizens Past Commission analysis suggests, however, that this policy has not provided equal access to all California citizens Prior analysis indicates that the proportion of students from middle-income backgrounds enrolled at the University and the State University decreased from 1982 to 1988 -- a period during which growth occurred statewide in this income group However, Student Aid Commission analysis of data from the 1985 and 1992 Student Expenses and Resources Surveys (SEARS) suggests that changes in the proportion of middle-income students enrolled at the University and State University are consistent with changes in this income group in the population as a whole Commission staff will reexamine this issue based on its own analysis of income data now available from SEARS

As is the case with any increase in student fees, students from low- and middle-income backgrounds could be seriously affected by this proposal if the State and its public institutions do not provide sufficient financial aid to offset the fee increase for needy students An estimate of the amount of additional aid required to offset the fee increase for needy students resulting from implementation of this proposal is discussed below under the section titled "Potential Fiscal Impact of the Option "

In addition to providing more financial aid, this proposal would also require a more effective financial aid delivery system if the State wishes to maximize the opportunity for low- and middle-income students to attend its public colleges and universities Four of the financial aid delivery system issues which would need to be addressed include

- First, the State would need to overcome the problem of "sticker shock" -- whereby students and parents incorrectly determine that higher education is beyond their economic means because they look only at the stated fee level without considering the availability of student financial aid Combatting this problem would require an intensive public information campaign in order to ensure that needy potential students know about the availability of financial aid and the process by which to apply for it The costs of that program could be funded from the increase in student fee revenues
- Second, the process of applying for financial aid would need to be streamlined so that it does not discourage qualified students from applying for aid
- Once a student applied and was deemed eligible, the process by which students receive aid would need to be more efficient and less burdensome
- Finally, since greater numbers of students would require financial aid, the workload of the systems' financial aid offices would increase Additional funds would be needed to expand those offices and ensure that needy students receive aid

Access to higher education is hampered not only by student charges but also by insufficient institutional revenue to allow colleges and universities to offer the classes students need or desire Proponents of this proposal argue that by charging higher student fees, institutions will be able not only to offer the necessary classes to ensure that students can complete their degrees in a timely fashion but also to provide increased grant aid to help needy students meet the costs of higher education A more extensive discussion of the issue of student access and an illustration of the potential consequences on students access under this option is included in the introduction to this report

Potential fiscal impact of the option

Display 4 on the next page summarizes the Commission staff's estimates of the additional student fee revenue that would be generated and the additional financial aid that would be required under various percentage of cost of instruction scenarios for each of the three systems All calculations are for undergraduate students only and do not include any revenues generated or aid required by graduate students should this fee option be extended to apply to graduate as well as undergraduate students

Throughout the analysis, Commission staff has attempted to be as conservative as possible in estimating the amount of net additional student fee revenue that may be generated from implementation of these scenarios If the level of grant aid estimated below is more than the amount actually needed to serve financially needy students, net revenues resulting from implementation of these options would be greater than that estimated

What follows is intended to assist the reader in accurately interpreting the data presented in Display 4 for each of the systems

California Community Colleges

As previously noted, students attending California's community colleges currently pay about 9 percent of the total average cost of instruction which Commission staff calculates to be $3,178 per FTES for this analysis As Display 4 indicates, if the State were to adopt a policy that required community college students to pay 15 percent of the total average cost of instruction, fees for a full-time student would increase $175 per year to a total of $475 per year or $16 00 per semester unit Commission staff estimates that at this level, after providing additional student financial aid, this proposal would net approximately $57 million in new student fee revenue (see Attachment for an explanation of the Commission's methodology for estimating necessary financial aid) The cost of providing these additional grants is approximately $62 million, or 52 percent, of the total $119 million in additional student fee revenue generated by this proposal If this level of grant aid is provided and information regarding its availability is comprehensively distributed, Commission staff believe that student enrollment declines related *exclusively* to the student fee increase will be minimal Staff's estimates of the additional fee revenue and financial aid associated with increasing fees to 25 and 35 percent of the cost of instruction in the community colleges are also presented in Display 4

DISPLAY 4 Implications of Implementing Fees as a Percentage of the Cost of Instruction in California's Public Colleges and Universities Under Various Scenarios

California Community Colleges (Estimated total cost of instruction $3,178, current systemwide fee level $300 Students currently pay about 9 percent of total average cost.)

Fees as a Specific Percent of the Cost of Instruction	15%	25%	35%
Student Fees Per Year	$475 ($16 00 per semester unit)	$800 ($26 50 per semester unit, approximately equal to the Governor's Budget proposal)	$1,110 ($37 00 per semester unit, approximately the national two-year college average)
Additional Student Fee Revenue Generated	$119 million	$332 million	$542 million
Additional Amount of Financial Aid Required for Needy Students	$62 million	$180 million	$298 million
Percentage of Additional Gross Fee Revenue Returned to Financial Aid	52 percent	54 percent	55 percent
Net Additional Student Fee Revenue*	$57 million	$152 million	$244 million

The California State University (Estimated total cost of instruction $7,551, current systemwide fee level $1,308 Students currently pay about 17 percent of total average cost)

Fees as a Specific Percent of the Cost of Instruction	25%	35%	50%
Student Fees Per Year	$1,890	$2,640 (approximate average of CSU public faculty salary comparison group)	$3,775
Additional Student Fee Revenue Generated	$147 million	$337 million	$623 million
Additional Amount of Financial Aid Required for Needy Students	$ 75 million	$176 million	$341 million
Percentage of Additional Gross Fee Revenue Returned to Financial Aid	51 percent.	52 percent	55 percent
Net Additional Student Fee Revenue*	$72 million	$161 million	$282 million

University of California (Estimated total cost of instruction $12,168 current systemwide fee level $2,824 Students currently pay about 23 percent of total average costs)

Fees as a Specific Percent of the Cost of Instruction	30%	35%	50%
Student Fees Per Year	$3,650 (approximate average of UC faculty salary comparison group)	$4,260 (approximately equal to the University of Michigan's fees)	$6,085
Additional Student Fee Revenue Generated	$103 million	$179 million	$406 million
Additional Amount of Financial Aid Required for Needy Students	$45 million	$81 million	$208 million
Percentage of Additional Gross Fee Revenue Returned to Financial Aid	44 percent	45 percent	51 percent
Net Additional Student Fee Revenue*	$58 million	$98 million	$198 million

* Net fee revenue figures do not take into consideration additional funding required for a comprehensive public information campaign regarding the availability of additional aid, and they do not consider the added funding required for adequately staffing student financial aid offices

Source California Postsecondary Education Commission staff calculations

The California State University

Students attending the California State University currently pay about 17 percent of the total average cost of instruction which Commission staff calculates to be $7,551 per FTES As Display 4 shows, if the State were to adopt a policy that required State University undergraduate students to pay 35 percent of the total average cost of instruction, fees for a full-time undergraduate would increase $1,332 per year to a total of $2,640 per year -- roughly equivalent to average student fees charged at the State University's 15 public faculty salary comparison institutions At this level, Commission staff estimates that, after providing additional student financial aid, this proposal would net approximately $161 million in new student fee revenue (see Attachment for an explanation of Commission staff's methodology for estimating necessary financial aid) The cost of providing these additional grants is approximately $176 million, or 52 percent, of the total $337 million in additional student fee revenue generated by this proposal If this level of grant aid is provided and information regarding its availability is comprehensively distributed, Commission staff believe that undergraduate enrollment declines related *exclusively* to the student fee increase will be minimal Staff's estimates of the additional fee revenue and financial aid associated with increasing State University undergraduate student fees to 25 and 50 percent of the cost of instruction are also presented in Display 4

University of California

University of California students currently pay about 23 percent of the total average cost of instruction which Commission staff calculates to be $12,168 per FTES As Display 4 indicates, if the State were to adopt a policy that required University undergraduate students to pay 30 percent of the total average cost of instruction, fees for a full-time undergraduate would increase $826 per year to a total of $3,650 per year -- approximately equivalent to the average student fees charged by the University's faculty salary comparison institutions At this level, the Commission estimates that, after providing additional student financial aid, this proposal would net approximately $58 million in new student fee revenue (see Attachment for an explanation of Commission staff's methodology for estimating necessary financial aid) The cost of providing these additional grants is approximately $45 million, or 44 percent, of the total $103 million in additional student fee revenue generated by this proposal If this level of grant aid is provided and information regarding its availability is comprehensively distributed, Commission staff believe that undergraduate enrollment declines related exclusively to the student fee increase will be minimal Staff's estimates of the additional fee revenue and financial aid associated with increasing University undergraduate student fees to 35 and 50 percent of the cost of instruction are also presented in Display 4

3. Set Student Fees at California's Public Colleges and Universities on a Sliding Scale Based on Income

The proposed option

Base fees paid by each student at California's public colleges and universities on student or parent income, depending on whether the student is dependent on his or her parents for support

Background on the option

Given the limited availability of State resources, the impetus behind the proposal is logical and rational reducing the State subsidy for wealthy students enrolled in California public higher education The concept of charging students based on their ability to pay -- the purpose of this proposal -- is not new Rather, it has been the practice of higher education institutions nationally for at least the last five decades However, rather than charging students fees based on their or their family's adjusted gross income, higher education institutions have relied upon the financial aid process for determining the student's and his/her family's ability to pay

Potential non-fiscal impact of the option

While Commission staff is generally supportive of the goal of this policy option -- focusing the State's limited resources on those students with the most limited financial resources -- it has identified the following concerns

- The sliding fee scale would be costly to administer since the educational systems would have to establish an entity to collect and verify income information for each student and set fees based on that information However, the Commission staff has spoken with staff at the Franchise Tax Board concerning the feasibility of collecting and verifying income information through the State's tax records, an option that the Commission staff believe could lessen the cost of verifying income information Based on arrangements that are currently in place for other State agencies to collect income information, it appears that if the appropriate social security numbers could be submitted to the Franchise Tax Board (the student's for independent students and the parents' for dependent students), income information could be gathered rather inexpensively Staff at the University of California have argued, however, that the Federal Privacy Act precludes the University from collecting and using social security numbers for this purpose

  In any case, since financial aid would remain and continue to be important to many students, the resources needed to set and collect the appropriate fees from each student would be in addition to the resources needed to administer financial aid programs In addition, once the fees for each student are set, having multiple student charges within an institution would probably require increased administrative oversight in the collection of student fees and hence increase the costs of fee collection within the systems

- A multitude of student charges within a single institution could result from this policy option The Commission staff is concerned that various charges within one institution could confuse prospective students
- Basing student fees on income fails to account for factors other than income that can influence a student's ability to pay for college costs The financial aid needs analysis system, which is used to determine eligibility for financial aid, yields a more sophisticated analysis of a student's family financial resources It examines factors in addition to income such as assets, family size, and any mechanisms used to shelter income
- The "step effect" is another issue which would need to be addressed prior to this proposal's implementation For example, if the income level for triggering an increase in student fees was $60,000, individuals earning $59,990 would pay less than individuals earning only $10 more This "step effect" could be partially alleviated, however, by having numerous steps, or eliminated entirely by setting the fee level at a specified percentage of income and making the two a linear relationship
- This policy option would give the State's public institutions the incentive to enroll more students from high-income backgrounds in order to maximize revenue to the institution This incentive would be inconsistent with the goal of providing access to all students regardless of income, which is central to each of these options
- This policy option carries a possible negative impact on student attitudes and campus climate To the extent that students from high-income families pay more in fees than students from less well-to-do families, the perception could develop that students from high-income families are subsidizing students from lower-income families This could result in divisions in a campus student body rather than creating a community where all individuals are equal

If the goal of the State is to decrease the level of support students from wealthy families receive from the State in the form of a subsidized higher education, rather than implementing a sliding scale student fee policy, policy makers should consider raising the level of fees for all students and using the existing financial aid system to determine a student's ability to pay The financial aid system is better equipped for determining a student's ability to pay and could distribute increased amounts of financial aid to needy students, thereby continuing to provide access to those from low- and middle-income families This alternative, however, runs counter to the State's historic commitment of keeping student fees as low as possible

By charging all students the higher fee levels and by using the financial aid system to assist needy students with those fee increases, the State and its public institutions would not need to create a second, potentially costly bureaucracy for determining the amount of fees each student should pay In addition, that system can better determine students' ability to pay than a system that relies exclusively on income as proposed by the sliding fee scale Thus, relying upon the financial aid process rather than on the proposed sliding fee scale may be a more appropriate means by which to charge students based on their ability to pay for the reasons articulated above

Potential fiscal impact of the option

The following analysis contains the Commission staff's estimates of the additional student fee revenue that would be generated by instituting three different types of sliding fee scales There are, however, countless alternative ways in which such a fee policy could be structured, and they would generate equally numerous alternative amounts of fee revenue Thus, the following analysis is meant simply to illustrate the fiscal impact of three types of sliding scale fee structures

The approaches used in the three different sliding scale examples are illustrated in Displays 5 and 6 on pages 36-37 In each example, fees are eliminated for the lowest income students In the first example, student fees are pegged at a percentage of the marginal cost of education that varies with income levels The lowest income students pay 0 percent of marginal cost, and the percentage paid grows with income until the highest income students pay 100 percent of marginal cost The second example is very similar to the first, except that it pegs fees to the average cost of instruction rather than the marginal cost of instruction This example results in higher fees than the first example The third example works differently than the first two in that it ties fees to a percentage of income rather than to a percentage of cost Display 6 does not include fee levels associated with this example because every income level would have a different fee level

In this analysis, it is assumed that, since implementation of any of these examples would eliminate fees for the lowest income students and since State financial aid is generally limited to covering fees, State support for grants for needy students at the public segments would no longer be needed This would include financial aid administered by the public segments as

DISPLAY 5 Illustrative Sliding-Scale Fee Structure for Most Students Under 24 Years of Age[1]

Parent Income of Most Students Under 24 Years of Age	Option 1 Pay Percent of Marginal Cost: Percent of Marginal Cost	CCC Fees	CSU Fees	UC Fees	Option 2 Pay Percent of Average Cost: Percent of Average Cost	CCC Fees	CSU Fees	UC Fees
Less than $24,000	0%	$0	$0	$0	0%	$0	$0	$0
$24,000 - $35,999	5%	100	220	300	5%	159	378	608
$36,000 - $47,999	10%	200	440	600	10%	318	755	1,217
$48,000 - $59,999	20%	400	880	1,200	20%	636	1,510	2,434
$60,000 - $71,999	35%	700	1,540	2,100	35%	1,112	2,643	4,259
$72,000 - $83,999	55%	1,100	2,420	3,300	55%	1,748	4,153	6,692
$84,000 - 95,999	75%	1,500	3,300	4,500	75%	2,384	5,663	9,126
$96,000 and over	100%	2,000	4,400	6,000	100%	3,178	7,551	12,168

Source California Postsecondary Education Commission staff calculations.

DISPLAY 6 Illustrative Sliding-Scale Fee Structure for Students 24 Years of Age and Older and Others[2]

Income of Students 24 Years of Age and Older and Others	Option 1 Pay Percent of Marginal Cost: Percent of Marginal Cost	CCC Fees	CSU Fees	UC Fees	Option 2 Pay Percent of Average Cost: Percent of Average Cost	CCC Fees	CSU Fees	UC Fees
Less than $12,000	0%	$0	$0	$0	0%	$0	$0	$0
$12,000 - $23,999	10%	200	400	600	10%	318	755	1,217
$24,000 - $35,999	25%	500	1,100	1,500	25%	795	1,888	3,042
$36,000 - $47,999	50%	1,000	2,200	3,000	50%	1,589	3,776	6,084
$48,000 - $59,999	75%	1,500	3,300	4,500	75%	2,384	5,663	9,126
$60,000 and over	100%	2,000	4,400	6,000	100%	3,178	7,551	12,168

1 These were students who, by financial aid definitions, were considered financially dependent in 1991-92 They were generally all students under 24 years of age, although some students under 24, such as veterans, married students, and students who could demonstrate adequate resources to have been independent for several years before receiving financial aid, were not included in this group

2 These were students who, by financial aid definitions, were considered financially independent in 1991-92 They included all students 24 years of age and older and selected students under 24 such as those who were veterans, married students, and students who could demonstrate adequate resources to have been independent for several years before receiving financial aid.

Source California Postsecondary Education Commission staff calculations.

well as Cal Grant funding (except Cal Grant B subsistence) used to support needy students within public institutions

As illustrated in Display 7 on page 38, the fiscal impact of these options is measured in terms of both changes in student fee revenue and the money the State would save by eliminating financial aid grants to students in the public segments Both changes in student fee revenue and changes in financial aid were calculated relative to estimated levels for 1992-93

All calculations are for undergraduate students only and do not include any revenues generated by graduate students Since these fee policy options would raise fees only for those students from families that are unlikely to qualify for financial aid and would eliminate all or a portion of the fees for students from families likely to qualify for financial aid, this fiscal analysis, unlike the fiscal analyses of the other options in this report, assumes a reduction in support for financial aid

Option 3 Pay Percent of Income

CCC	CSU	UC
0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
0 5%	1 0%	1.5%
1 0%	2 0%	3 0%
1 5%	3 0%	4 5%
2 0%	4 0%	6.0%
2 5%	5 0%	7 5%
3 0%	6 0%	9 0%
3 5%	7 0%	10 5%

California Community Colleges

In each of the alternative fee options presented in this analysis, students with the lowest incomes would pay no fees In Option One, where fees would be tied to the marginal cost of instruction, Commission staff estimate that $140 million in additional fee revenue would be generated In addition, there is currently $31 million in institutional financial aid used to cover fees that would become unnecessary since the lowest income students would be charged no fees However, since this funding is a part of the Proposition 98 guarantee, it would not result in any General Fund savings and would continue to be used to support K-14 education Thus, this option would have a net impact identical with the added fee revenue generated from the fee increase, or $140 million

Option 3 Pay Percent of Income

CCC	CSU	UC
0 0%	0 0%	0.0%
0 5%	1 0%	1 5%
1 0%	2 0%	3 0%
1 5%	3 0%	5 0%
2 5%	5 0%	7 5%
3 5%	7 0%	10 5%

In Option Two, where fees would be tied to the average rather than the marginal cost of instruction, Commission staff estimate that $356 million in additional revenue would be generated In Option Three, where fees would be a percent of income, Commission staff estimate that an additional $162 million in fee revenue would be generated

The California State University

In each of the alternative fee options presented in this analysis, students with the lowest incomes would pay no fees In Option One, where fees would be tied to the marginal cost of instruction, Commission staff estimate that $75 million less fee revenue would be generated than would be generated with the 1992-93 fee levels However, $83 million in institutional and Cal Grant financial aid would become unnecessary since the lowest income students would be charged no fees Thus, this option would have a net impact of $8 million

In Option Two, where fees would be tied to the average rather than the marginal cost of instruction, Commission staff estimate that $110 million in additional revenue would be generated Adding to this the $83 million in institutional and Cal Grant financial aid that would no longer be needed to cover fees would yield a net impact of $193 million

Option Three, where fees would be a percent of income, would generate

DISPLAY 7 Implications of Implementing Three Types of Sliding Fee Scales in California's Public Colleges and Universities (Dollars in Millions)

	System		
	California Community Colleges	The California State University	University of California
OPTION 1: Percent of Marginal Cost			
Change in Student Fee Revenue	$140	-$75	-$95
Institutional Funds No Longer Required to Offset Fees	-- [1]	70	49
Reduced Cal Grant Funding	--	13	39
Net Impact	$140	$8	-$7
OPTION 2: Percent of Average Cost			
Change in Student Fee Revenue	$356	$110	$169
Institutional Funds No Longer Required to Offset Fees	-- [1]	70	49
Reduced Cal Grant Funding	--	13	39
Net Impact	$356	$193	$257
OPTION 3: Percent of Income			
Change in Student Fee Revenue	$162	$12	$101
Institutional Funds No Longer Required to Offset Fees	-- [1]	70	49
Reduced Cal Grant Funding	--	13	39
Net Impact	$162	$95	$189

1 While the $31 million currently used to support the community colleges' institutional financial aid program would no longer be needed to offset fees, this funding would remain a part of the Proposition 98 guarantee and would become a part of community college apportionments

Source California Postsecondary Education Commission staff calculations

an additional $12 million in fee revenue The net impact of this option would be $95 million after accounting for the $83 million in institutional and Cal Grant financial aid that would no longer be needed to cover fees

University of California

In each of the alternative fee options presented in this analysis, students with the lowest incomes would pay no fees In Option One, where fees would be tied to the marginal cost of instruction, Commission staff estimate that $95 million less fee revenue would be generated than would be generated with the 1992-93 fee levels However, $88 million in institutional and Cal Grant financial aid would become unnecessary since the lowest income students would be charged no fees Thus, this option would have a net impact of -$7 million

In Option Two, where fees would be tied to the average rather than the marginal cost of instruction, Commission staff estimate that $169 million in additional revenue would be generated Adding to this the $88 million in institutional and Cal Grant financial aid that would no longer be needed to cover fees would yield a net impact of $257 million

Option Three, where fees would be a percent of income, would generate an additional $101 million in fee revenue The net impact of this option would be $189 million after accounting for the $88 million in institutional and Cal Grant financial aid that would no longer be needed to cover fees

4. Establish Guidelines for Setting Student Charges

The proposed option

The State should establish guidelines, as opposed to a specified formula, for annually setting and adjusting student charges at California's public colleges and universities

Background on the option

In 1988, the Legislature requested the Commission to work in consultation with a broad-based advisory committee to develop a long-term policy relating to the setting and adjusting of nonresident tuition at California's public colleges and universities As a result of those discussions, in 1989, the Commission recommended that, in annually adjusting the nonresident tuition level, each system, at a minimum, should consider (1) the nonresident charges at comparable public institutions, and (2) the full average cost of instruction in their system It further recommended that total nonresident charges not fall below the marginal cost of instruction for the system The Commission's recommendation did not include any specific formula to be followed by the systems as they annually adjust nonresident tuition levels, only that they take into consideration the above factors as they set the tuition level The Commission's recommendation was subsequently placed into State statute in 1990 through enactment of Senate Bill 2116

The option proposed here would essentially replicate the current State policy relating to the adjustment of nonresident tuition and would identify those factors that the systems should consider as they annually adjust the student fee level For example, the policy could direct the systems that, as they annually adjust their resident student fee levels, they take into consideration several factors, including, but not limited to (1) charges at comparable public institutions, (2) the average cost of instruction, (3) the marginal cost of instruction, (4) overall State General Fund support, (5) the amount of resources necessary to offer a sufficient number of courses to allow students to make timely progress to their degree, and (6) the amount of aid needed to assist financially needy students in paying the cost of college attendance The policy might also include some limits as to how much fees can increase or decrease in any given period

Potential non-fiscal impact of the option

While this policy option would increase the systems' flexibility in adjusting student fee levels, without some limitations as to how much fees can increase in any one period, it raises questions as to whether future fee increases will be gradual, moderate, or predictable These three principles

-- gradual, moderate, and predictable -- are fundamental elements of the State's existing fee policy and a discussion should occur about whether they should be incorporated into the State's future long-term student fee policy Commission staff believe that, at a minimum, these principles should be included in the next long-term student fee policy as goals of the State and its public systems

As is the case with any proposed increase in student fees, students from low- and middle-income backgrounds could be seriously affected if the State and its public institutions do not provide sufficient financial aid to offset the fee increase for needy students As a result, special attention should be paid to ensure that adequate aid is provided to assist needy students in offsetting any fee increases that may occur as a result of implementation of this policy option

Attachment Methodology for Estimating Eligibility for Financial Aid

This attachment describes the methodology utilized by the Commission to estimate the pool of financially needy students given the different fee increases considered in this report The analyses in this report assume that all needy students receive grant aid to fully offset fee increases They further assume that the funding to support this additional financial aid will come from fee revenue generated from the fee increase Thus, the pool of needy students needs to be estimated in order to determine both the additional support needed to provide needy students with financial aid and the net revenue available given the student fee levels considered in this report

Fee Levels

Fee levels for full-time students were identified according to the methodology specified in the option write-up Fee levels for part-time students at the community colleges were calculated based on a per-unit cost and a load of six units per term Fee levels for part-time students at the California State University were calculated assuming six units per term and charges that are 58 percent of the cost of a full-time load (as is the case with the 1992-93 fee structure at the State University) Since the proportion of University of California students who are part-time is so small -- less than 7 percent -- revenue estimates were made assuming that all University students were full-time The ratio of full-time to part-time students in each segment was estimated based upon the results of the 1992 Student Expenses and Resources Survey, or SEARS

Estimation of the Number of Financially Needy Students

After the gross revenue from each fee increase was calculated (based upon all students paying fees), the number of financially needy students requiring financial aid to offset the fee and the funding required to support this financial aid were estimated These estimates were based upon the distribution of students' family incomes for each segment as identified in the SEARS results Parent income was used for dependent students, and student income was used for independent students All students with family incomes below certain levels (depending upon both whether the student was independent or dependent and the fee level) were estimated to be eligible for financial aid

SEARS yielded family income information in income ranges, and not discrete levels of income Thus, SEARS results lacked information on the number of students below some of the different income thresholds used to estimate the number of financially needy students given a certain fee level In order not to be limited to the income levels specified in the SEARS income ranges, CPEC staff assumed that family incomes were distributed evenly across the income ranges For example, in the income range of $24,000 to $35,999, it was assumed that there were the same number of individuals with incomes between $24,000 and $24,999 as there were with income between $33,000 and $33,999 Based on these assumptions, Commission staff made estimates of students below certain income levels not included in the results of SEARS

In using family income to estimate the number of needy students, Commission staff is not suggesting that all students falling within these income categories actually receive grant assistance, but it uses this group as a proxy for the total number of students that would likely be determined to be financially needy, according to federal needs analysis standards While the majority of students determined to be financially needy will likely fall within these income categories, some students from higher income groups will be needy and hence eligible for grant assistance, while all students from the income groups presented in this study may not be determined to be needy and hence would not receive aid

The income levels below which students were estimated to be eligible for financial aid given different fee increases are listed below in Display 8

DISPLAY 8 Income Levels Below Which Students Were Estimated to be Financially Needy, Given Specified Fee Levels

	Percentage of Cost of Instruction			Maintain Current Student Fee Policy
California Community Colleges	15%	25%	35%	
Full-Time Fee Level	$475	$800	$1,110	$330
Full-Time Dependent	$32,000	$33,000	$34,000	$32,000
Full-Time Independent	$22,000	$23,000	$24,000	$22,000
Part-Time Dependent	$31,000	$32,000	$32,000	$31,000
Part-Time Independent	$21,000	$22,000	$22,000	$21,000
The California State University	25%	35%	50%	
Full-Time Fee Level	$1,890	$2,640	$3,775	$1,439
Full-Time Dependent	$40,000	$42,000	$45,000	$39,000
Full-Time Independent	$18,000	$19,000	$20,000	$18,000
Part-Time Dependent	$38,000	$39,000	$41,000	$37,000
Part-Time Independent	$17,000	$17,000	$18,000	$17.000
University of California	30%	35%	50%	
Full-Time Fee Level	$3,650	$4,260	$6,085	$3,106
Dependent	$46,000	$48,000	$54,000	$44,000
Independent	$20,000	$21,000	$24,000	$20,000

Source California Postsecondary Education Commission staff estimates

The net fiscal impact of each fee level was calculated by subtracting the financial aid needed to assist needy students from the total fee revenue

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 17 members Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly Six others represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California Two student members are appointed by the Governor

As of February 1995, the Commissioners representing the general public are

Henry Der, San Francisco, *Chair*
C Thomas Dean, Long Beach
Elaine Alquist, Santa Clara
Mim Andelson, Los Angeles
Jeffrey I Marston, San Diego
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr , San Francisco, *Vice Chair*
Melinda G Wilson, Torrance
Linda J Wong, Los Angeles
Ellen F Wright, Saratoga

Representatives of the segments are

Roy T Brophy, Fair Oaks, appointed by the Regents of the University of California,

Yvonne W Larsen, San Diego appointed by the California State Board of Education,

Alice Petrossian, Glendale, appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges,

Ted J Saenger, San Francisco, appointed by the Trustees of the California State University, and

Kyhl Smeby, Pasadena, appointed by the Governor to represent California's independent colleges and universities, and

vacant, representing the Council for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education

The two student representatives are

Stephen Lesher, Meadow Vista
Beverly A Sandeen, Costa Mesa

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs "

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including community colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools

As an advisory body to the Legislature and Governor, the Commission does not govern or administer any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them Instead, it performs its specific duties of planning, evaluation, and coordination by cooperating with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform those other governing, administrative, and assessment functions

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California By law, its meetings are open to the public Requests to speak at a meeting may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request before the start of the meeting

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, Warren Halsey Fox, Ph D , who is appointed by the Commission

Further information about the Commission and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1303 J Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, California 98514-2938, telephone (916) 445-7933 or Calnet 485-7933, FAX (916) 327-4417

Undergraduate Student Charges and Short-Term Financial Aid Policies at California's Public Universities

Commission Report 93-8

ONE of a series of reports published by the California Postsecondary Education Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities Single copies may be obtained without charge from the Commission at 1303 J Street, Fifth Floor, Sacramento, California 95814-2938 Recent reports include

92-25 *Meeting the Challenge Preparing for Long-Term Change in California Higher Education, by Warren H Fox Report of the Executive Director to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, August 24, 1992* (August 1992)

92-26 *California College and University Exchange Programs with Mexico A Staff Report in Response to a Request from the 1991 United State-Mexico Border Conference on Education* (October 1992)

92-27 *Appropriations in the 1992-93 State Budget for Higher Education A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission* (October 1992)

92-28 *Legislation Affecting Higher Education During the Second Year of the 1991-92 Session A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission* (October 1992)

92-29 *Eligibility and Participation in California's Public Universities in the Year 2000 Projections by the Staff of the California Postsecondary Education Commission* (October 1992)

92-30 *Proposed Construction of Folsom Lake College in the Los Rios Community College District A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request from the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges* (December 1992)

92-31 *Proposed Construction of the Lompoc Valley Center in the Allan Hancock Joint Community College District A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request from the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges* (December 1992)

93-1 *Legislative and State Budget Priorities of the Commission, 1993 A Report of the California Postsecon-dary Education Commission* (February 1993)

93-2 *Expenditures for University Instruction A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Supplemental Report Language for the 1991 Budget Act* (April 1993)

93-3 *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1993-94 A Report to the Legislature and the Governor in Response to Concurrent Resolution No 51 (1965)* (April 1993)

93-4 *Executive Compensation in California's Public Universities, 1992-93 A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to the 1992 Budget Act* (April 1993)

93-5 *Status Report on Human Corps Activities, 1992 The Last in a Series of Five Progress Reports to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 1820 (Chapter 1245, Statutes of 1987)* (April 1993)

93-6 *The Master Plan, Then and Now Policies of the 1960-1975 Master Plan for Higher Education in Light of 1993 Realities* (April 1993)

93-7 *The Restructuring of California's Financial Aid Programs and Its Short-Term Aid Policy Recommendations of the California Postsecondary Education Commission* (April 1993)

93-8 *Undergraduate Student Charges and Short-Term Financial Aid Policies at California's Public Universities Recommendations of the California Postsecondary Education Commission* (April 1993)

Undergraduate Student Charges and Short-Term Financial Aid Policies at California's Public Universities

Commission Report 93-8